

# COLLOQUY

Rex Gooch writes with respect to Times New Roman "A great step forward in appearance". He makes some further suggestions:

- (1) New paragraphs are normally indicated by an indent to the first line or about one line space after the previous paragraph--you do both! The indent has some disadvantages: it must disappear when it is the first paragraph after a heading, including the first paragraph in an article, [and] it affects choice of indents within the paragraph as for quotes and tables. So for simplicity I would suggest starting all paragraphs flush left.
- (2) The business of sans serif vs serif: we are accustomed to serifs, so allegedly read them faster. The use of sans serif for heads will then slow you down, as is desirable. However, this guideline does not apply when the typeface is small, when sans serif must be used.
- (3) The type size you are using is big for an academic journal, but much better for older readers.
- (4) You should see to it that the leading for everything, including headings, diagrams, etc., is a multiple of 12 point, because then facing pages will have lines aligned.
- (5) I prefer page numbers centre bottom, where they do not interfere visually with the title.
- (6) [I] would prefer to see author closer to the title (save some space).
- (7) I always set subheads tight above the paragraph which they describe [no space between sub-head and first line of paragraph]. Bold body text is just fine; alternatives include spaced body (as in *S u b h e a d*) and italic body.
- (8) Superscripts...are usually baseline shifted upwards, and at (say) 70% of body text. You have them full size.

Don Hauptman comments on "Textual Logology" that rivers of type were not christened by Fritz Striabel. "The term 'river' for vertical channels in a paragraph of text has been used for decades (maybe centuries) by art directors. When obvious, it's a problem caused by the absence of hyphenation or other poor typesetting, such as a mismatched font and line length." Rex Gooch concurs, saying that "they should never happen. With either old-fashioned or proper new methods of typesetting, they can be made to disappear. So finding them is like finding misspellings or wrong page numbers."

Susan Thorpe adds to Jeremy Morse's number name transadditions in the November Kickshaws (an asterisk indicates a gap-filler to the table on p 237 of *Making the Alphabet Dance*):

31 nitrophyte, 39 penitentiaryship, 41 confectory, 45 overfaithfully\*, 47 fever-destroying\*  
49 renotifying, 51 refortifying, 57 oversufficiently\*, 60 ptyxis, 61 thyroxines, 69 inexistency,  
70 vestrymen, 71 nerve-destroying\*, 70 oversufficiently\*, 82 wealth-boastingly\*,  
83 tychoparthenogenesis\*, 84 selffrighteously\*, 86 inextinguishably\*, 89 inhomogeneity,  
90 inneity, 91 noneternity, 93 trimethylbenzene, 94 unfortunately\*, 95 indefinitely\*,  
96 inexistency, 98 hyperventilating



All words can be found in Webster's Second. A full article by Rex Gooch on transadditions of number names will appear in a future Word Ways.

Errata: Daniel McGrath points out that in "Palindromic Fortune Cookies" ENOS, I TORCH CORTISONE is defective. Rex Gooch says that the title of p 272 should be "How Many Anagrams Are There?" and the one on p 284, "(Near) Ideal Eight-Letter Word Ladders" ("folk searching the title will think I found no ideal ladders of this length").

Rex Gooch writes "Chris Cole raises some interesting questions but his answers are too definite. Here is a contribution to a discussion:

- (1) I would love to know why he says there are 2 million words in English. I do not doubt one can exceed this figure if accepting theoretical forms such as (perhaps) absolutelessnesses. In a huge dictionary we might find half a million definitions but many will be of obsolete words.
- (2) Is the average length of an English word 12 letters? Perhaps it may be for some scientific papers, but I doubt it is anywhere near that in normal text. Even in a dictionary, the average length struggles to exceed 10. Perhaps Chris is referring to the average length of words in a dictionary including derived forms that do not appear in the dictionary.
- (3) When he refers to inefficiency I take it he means efficiency of symbol use. The efficiency of English is much enhanced by using words which combine known concepts such as quadbike, rather than requiring people to learn another word such as buke.
- (4) [Chris] does not define homograph, which I understand to be the same group of letters with a different origin and meaning (note the 'and'). I notice Web 3 says 'differing in meaning or origin or pronunciation' which would permit many more.
- (5) His table of the number of meanings or senses for certain words has some astonishingly large numbers. On the one hand, large dictionaries have just two or three main entries for normal modern usage of 'break'; on the other, Chris counts 245 senses. Perusing these, I tend to the view that they often list different common contexts or associations for the same sense (when making a ball break, it seems to me not to matter what the game is). For the noun 'break' the Shorter Oxford lists 11 main meanings, the OED 22, and Web 3 12 with 89 total senses. For the verb 'break', the Shorter Oxford lists 3 principal meanings, 21 main meanings, and the OED 42 (non-compound) main meanings, compared to the 20 main meanings and 156 senses in Web 3. Like Web 3, the Oxford dictionaries also give a further level of breakdown in finer shades of meaning. I tentatively suggest that the lowest level of senses exaggerates the number of distinct meanings, which is the opposite to Chris's conclusion in his comments on splitters and groupers (it seems to me that the OED and Web 3 are both splitters at the sense level). My counts are approximate because I have not defined precisely which variants and compounds I counted.

Susan Thorpe adds the following OED words to the longest monoconsonantals and monovocalics in the August Kickshaws: UBBUBBOO, SNUFF-MUNDUNGUS, CHLOROBROMOFORM.